

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID M. ROUTT, JR.,
Plaintiff,
v.
HENRIK FISHER,
Defendant.

Case No. 2:25-cv-00627-FLA (KSx)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
ACTION SHOULD NOT BE
CONSOLIDATED WITH GEORGE
JENETOPULOS, ET AL., V. HENRIK
FISHER, ET AL., 2:24-CV-09760-FLA
(KSX) AND STUART EGGERTSEN V.
HENRIK FISHER, CASE NO. 2:25-
CV-00236-FLA (KSX)**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE


Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a), a court may consolidate actions involving “a common question of law or fact” and has “broad discretion under this rule to consolidate cases pending in the same district.” *Invs. Rsch. Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for Cent. Dist. of California*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989); *see also In re Adams Apple, Inc.*, 829 F.2d 1484, 1487 (9th Cir. 1987) (courts “may consolidate cases *sua sponte*”) (citation omitted). “To determine whether to consolidate, a court weighs the interest in judicial convenience against the potential for delay, confusion, and prejudice caused by consolidation.” *Paxonet Commc’ns, Inc. v. TranSwitch Corp.*, 303 F. Supp. 2d 1027, 1028 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (citation omitted).

Here, it appears the benefits of judicial economy and convenience from consolidating this action with *George Jenetopulos, et al., v. Henrik Fisker, et al.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-09760-FLA (KSx) (“Jenetopulos Action”) and *Stuart Eggertsen v. Henrik Fisker*, Case No. 2:25-cv-00236-FLA (KSx) (“Eggersten Action”) outweighs any potential for delay, confusion, and prejudice, as each action asserts the same claims against similar defendants.

Accordingly, the parties are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing only within fourteen (14) days of this Order why this action should not be consolidated with the Jenetopulos Action and the Eggertsen Action. Responses shall be limited to five (5) pages in length. Failure to respond may result in consolidation of the actions without further notice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 27, 2025


FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA
United States District Judge